

Luther	Pickering	Skelton
Lynch	Pitts	Slaughter
Maloney (CT)	Platts	Smith (NJ)
Maloney (NY)	Pombo	Smith (TX)
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Portman	Snyder
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Solis
McCarthy (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Spratt
McCollum	Putnam	Stark
McCrery	Radanovich	Stearns
McGovern	Rahall	Stump
McHugh	Rangel	Sullivan
McInnis	Regula	Sununu
McKeon	Reyes	Tanner
McKinney	Reynolds	Tauscher
McNulty	Rivers	Tauzin
Meehan	Rodriguez	Taylor (NC)
Meek (FL)	Roemer	Thomas
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Menendez	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Millender-	Rohrabacher	Thune
McDonald	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Miller, Dan	Ross	Tiahrt
Miller, Gary	Rothman	Tiberi
Miller, Jeff	Roukema	Tierney
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Toomey
Mollohan	Royce	Turner
Moran (VA)	Rush	Udall (CO)
Morella	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Myrick	Nadler	Velazquez
Nadler	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Napolitano	Sanchez	Walden
Neal	Sanders	Walsh
Nethercutt	Sandlin	Wamp
Ney	Sawyer	Waters
Northup	Saxton	Watkins (OK)
Norwood	Schakowsky	Watson (CA)
Nussle	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Obey	Schrock	Watts (OK)
Ortiz	Scott	Waxman
Osborne	Sensenbrenner	Weiner
Ose	Serrano	Weldon (FL)
Otter	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Owens	Shadegg	Wexler
Oxley	Shaw	Whitfield
Pallone	Shays	Wilson (NM)
Pascarell	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Pastor	Sherwood	Wolf
Paul	Shimkus	Woolsey
Pelosi	Shows	Wynn
Pence	Shuster	Young (AK)
Peterson (PA)	Simmons	Young (FL)
Petri	Simpson	
Phelps	Skeen	

NOES—40

Aderholt	Hefley	Ramstad
Baird	Hilliard	Sabo
Baldwin	Kucinich	Stenholm
Borski	Larsen (WA)	Strickland
Brown (OH)	LoBiondo	Stupak
Capuano	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Condit	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Costello	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Crane	Miller, George	Visclosky
DeFazio	Moore	Weller
English	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Fattah	Oberstar	Wu
Filner	Oliver	
Gillmor	Peterson (MN)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Mascara	Smith (MI)
Blagojevich	McIntyre	Souder
Brady (PA)	Mica	Sweeney
Burton	Murtha	Terry
Cannon	Payne	Towns
Cunningham	Rehberg	Trafficant
Dicks	Riley	
Lampson	Schaffer	

□ 1915

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House,

the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SPORTS AGENT RESPONSIBILITY AND TRUST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and I joined to introduce the Sports Agent Responsibility and Trust Act.

Each year, hundreds of college athletes are offered illegal inducements to enter into contracts prior to the exhaustion of the athletes' eligibility by unscrupulous sports agents. Often these actions result in three major problems.

Number one, the loss of the athletes' eligibility. Personally, I experienced having a player back in the 1980s who was offered some illegal inducements, lost his eligibility, and pretty much ruined his career. That same player was involved with some agents who really had given illegal inducements to several players around the country. They were eventually indicted on a number of felonies. They threatened some of the players with bodily harm. However, in the State of Nebraska, we lacked the laws to pursue these agents.

Secondly, there is a financial loss to the athlete and the school when illegal agent offers are involved. Again, a personal note, I had a player back in the 1980s who thought he signed a contract for giving 3 percent of his proceeds to the agent, but somewhere buried in the contract was 13 percent. So he lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Fortunately, that player was able to recover more than \$300,000 because the agent with which he had signed the illegal contract had previously come from the State of California, where there are laws that govern agents, and since that agent had not registered under California law, we were able to recover \$300,000. However, in the State of Nebraska we could not do this because Nebraska, again, had no law that would enable us to prosecute.

Recently, an agent named Tank Black was sentenced to 5 years in prison for swindling athletes for more than \$12 million, and so we think this is important. It also allows the schools to file civil lawsuits against unethical agents.

Thirdly, another issue that is very important, a negative perception of intercollegiate athletics often results when athletes enter into illegal contracts with agents. So the recent pre-

vious cases would involve the University of Alabama, University of Louisville, University of California, University of Utah, Texas Southern, University of Miami at Florida, University of Southern California, Tennessee, Ohio State, Texas A&M, Florida State and others, and in each one of these cases the school really did nothing illegal. It simply had some players that entered into illegal negotiations with agents, and of course, this reflected negatively on the school.

Currently 17 States in our country, including my home State of Nebraska, have no regulations governing sports agents. The legislation that we are proposing provides a uniform Federal backstop that applies to all States. This bill does not supersede State law. It simply aids and abets those States that do have regulations governing sports agents.

This act brings sports agents under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, which provides for a fine of \$11,000 per day per event. State laws cannot cross State borders. So until all 50 States adopt uniform standards there is not uniformity in the law regulating sports agents.

The Sports Agent Responsibility Act provides a separate Federal remedy for States Attorneys General to prosecute sports agents who attempt to exploit student athletes across State lines.

I urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and me as we try to protect intercollegiate athletics from unscrupulous sports agents.

CUBA'S DEVELOPMENT OF BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a recent statement by the Bush administration confirming Cuba's development of a biological warfare program and the possible transfer of this knowledge to other rogue nations.

Mr. Speaker, Cuba is designated by the State Department as one of seven nations who sponsor international terrorism. However, since the collapse of the Soviet Union many Americans make the mistake of believing that Cuba is no longer a threat to our national security.

Recent votes here in the House have reflected this shift in public perception. Just 3 weeks ago we voted on a motion to instruct conferees on the farm bill to include a provision that would lift part of the trade embargo to allow for public financing of agricultural trade with Cuba. I opposed this motion because I feel that it is shortsighted to lift economic sanctions when the Cuban government has done little to prove their worthiness of an economic partnership with the United States.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro shows only his open hostility to the United States by pursuing biological warfare research. He has what are considered to be the most sophisticated biomedical capabilities in Latin America. Cuba stands as one of the few developing nations who plays a significant role in drug and biotechnology activities.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence that Cuba is experimenting with anthrax, as well as a number of other deadly pathogens. Some experts believe that Cuba is even capable of making genetically modified germ weapons that are able to defeat vaccines and antibiotics.

Unfortunately, the possibility that a rogue nation only 90 miles from our shores is producing biological weapons is not the worst of our problems. Mr. Speaker, intelligence officials have evidence that Cuba may be selling its bioterrorist knowledge to other nations hostile to the United States.

Last year, Castro visited Iran, Syria and Libya, three nations that occupy spots on the State Department's terrorism list, along with Cuba and three nations that are currently attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. During his visit to Tehran University, Castro stated that together Iran and Cuba could "bring America to its knees." An unnerving thought when we consider that Cuba is closer to the United States mainland than Washington, D.C., is to my home in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we put the debate about Cuba and the Castro regime into the proper perspective for the American people. Too often people are only willing to see the economic benefit of trade with Cuba and lifting the trade embargoes. They do not understand that by lifting the embargo, without agreements by Castro to stop biological weapons production and without commitments on human rights or civil liberties, that we are giving Castro exactly what he wants.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we see Castro and his regime for what they really are, a continued threat to the security of the United States.

RURAL TANF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this body will take up the reauthorization of the 1996 welfare law. Much has been said about this bill and no doubt debate will go on for some time. However, remarkably little has been said about one aspect of it, the rural aspect.

It will not be surprising to Members of this body that there is a difference between urban and rural areas. In fact, let me just tell my colleagues, 237 out of the 250 poorest counties in the United States in 1998 were nonmetropolitan, and that persists today.

One-half of rural American children and female heads of household live in poverty. Rural workers are nearly twice as likely to earn the minimum wage and 40 percent less likely to move out of low wage, entry level positions. Six out of 10 rural people in poverty do not own a car. The rural urban earning gap persists and actually has widened through the latter part of the 1990s. There is a gap of 73 to 70 percent.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at making work an essential part of the welfare effort, and I believe that work should be, in fact I think work is very honorable and we should encourage everyone to find the satisfaction as well as the responsibility of doing something that is valuable to themselves but also will have income, but the reality is this: Labor markets in rural areas are often very limited. There is a high unemployment rate in rural areas because the opportunities are not there.

So if we are indeed encouraging that more people should work, we need to then speak to putting in the infrastructure for training, jobs, day care and transportation, particularly those areas in the Mississippi Delta, the Appalachia and the Lower Rio Grande Valley and in Indian Country. It is in 240 of those 250 counties I talked about. So there are 240 counties in this country, the poorest counties, indeed will have difficulty finding jobs, maintaining the same work they had 3 years ago. Their unemployment indeed has gone up and the job opportunities have gone down.

The third exemption from time limits for counties with high rates of unemployment failed, let me say that again, failed to address the problem adequately in more rural areas. Official unemployment statistics underestimate the true rate of unemployment. There are many discouraged workers with few opportunities that do not even bother to go to the unemployment office or go seeking assistance because they know there are so little job opportunities. They know jobs do not exist, and therefore they do not even bother.

So if we use the known statistical data, that in itself is false, but also what we do know is that there is a lack of opportunity, and if indeed we wanted to find how States were responding to that, I have just submitted an amendment to the Rules Committee they ought to have to require each State governor to say to the Secretary in their plan how they propose to ensure there are job opportunities or if there are work opportunities, training opportunities, are there day care opportunities, transportation. All of that means new resources. So if we are not making any differential in adding new resources to rural areas, we are putting the governors in the States throughout the United States, putting them in a decisive difficult fiscal position, and we should ask them how they propose to meet that obligation that they are given.

So, in fact, in some rural areas the true unemployment is double. For ex-

ample, the official unemployment rate of Indian reservations often are 20 and 30 percent. However, according to the Department of Labor, it is sometimes higher than that, and yet we are requiring that individuals in those communities will have the same rate for the very poor.

Therefore, provisions of the legislation that are based on the official statistical data of unemployment is a false premise in order to give the governors the response to make a way. We need to find other ways of speaking to that.

So there needs to be a recognition, Mr. Speaker, that child care that is so essential for mothers to leave their children and go to work, that is not available in rural areas. Unless we are willing to provide for education and training, transportation, day care, the rural community will not be able to respond to the citizens who need that help, and the current proposal that is before this House has nothing in there. In fact, I will be asking for unanimous consent that we add that provision to the bill on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RAISING THE DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, tonight we want to come again before the body and talk about raising the debt limit.

□ 1930

It is fascinating, having been around this place for now almost 23 years, to hear and to see how various Members of this body react to certain situations that come up, depending on whether they are in the minority or in the majority. And there is no question that we have a serious problem facing our Nation coming up beginning this week, and then about June 28 it becomes of crisis proportion. Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill has formally requested Congress to increase the statutory limit on the publicly held debt by \$750 billion, and that is billion with a "b," up from the current level of \$5.95 trillion to \$6.7 trillion.